

REMARKS

Responses to the Final Office Action dated April 8, 2005, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration of this application.

The Office has rejected: claims 1-4, 7-9, 11, and 13-15 as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by Dorsett; claim 10 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Dorsett in view of Francis; and claims 5, 6, and 12 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Dorsett in view of Kumar.

Since all pending rejections rely on Dorsett as prior art, all rejections would be overcome by establishing that Dorsett is not prior art to the present invention.

Dorsett is not prior art to the present application. Dorsett has been cited as a prior reference under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), namely, a United States patent application having a filing date earlier than the invention date of the claimed invention. The earliest effective filing date of Dorsett is January 5, 2001. Applicants had conceived of and reduced to practice the invention claimed in each of rejected claims 1-15 prior to that date.

Attached hereto is a Declaration of all of the inventors attesting to such facts and providing the relevant supporting evidence thereof.

Accordingly, Dorsett is not prior art to any claim of the present application. Accordingly, all claim rejections are now rendered moot.

In view of the requested amendments, Applicant asserts that the pending claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the Office issue a Notice of Allowance at the earliest possible date. The Office is invited to contact

Applicant's undersigned counsel by telephone call in order to further the prosecution of this case in any way.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7.6.05



Theodore Naccarella
Registration No. 33,023
Synnestvedt & Lechner LLP
2600 Aramark Tower
1101 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19107
Telephone: (215) 923-4466
Facsimile: (215) 923-2189

M:\TNACCARELLA\CLIENTS\IBM\24929\PATENT OFFICE\RESPONSE TO 4-8-2005 OFFICE ACTION (DAS).DOC